



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Reu

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/978,753 11/26/97 MARKOVIC

I 07844/199001

ROGER S BOROVVOY
FISH & RICHARDSON
2200 SAND HILL ROAD
SUITE 100
MENLO PARK CA 94025

LM02/0320

EXAMINER

PAULA, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2776

DATE MAILED:
03/20/00

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/978,753

Applicant(s)

Markovic et al.

Examiner

Cesar B. Paula

Group Art Unit

2776



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 6, 2000

☐ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1035 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 10-28, 30, 31, 34, 38-40, and 42-45 is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) 5-9, 29, 32, 33, 35-37, and 41 is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2776

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 1/6/2000.

This action is made non-final.

2. In the amendment, claims 38-45 have been added. Claims 1-45 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 23-24, 27, and 38-40 are independent claims.

3. The rejections of claims 1-4, 13, 15-28, and 31-32 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DiMaria (Pat. # 4,174,175, 11/13/1979) in view of Slayden et al (Pat. # 5,652,901, 7/29/1997) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Drawings

4. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Specification

5. The title of the invention has been modified to be more indicative of the claimed invention; therefore the objection to the title has been withdrawn.

Claim Objections

6. Claim 10 objected to because of the following informalities: The Applicants disclose: "...inserting a page into copy of the". Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2776

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claim 45 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Applicants disclose “.....*determining the visual appearance includes providing an of the thickness ...*” (page 3).

9. Claims 1-4, 10-28, 30-31, 34, 38-40, and 42-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabata et al (Pat. # 5,774,232, 6/30/1998, filed on 9/21/1995) in view of Miller et al (Pat. # 5,696,605, 12/9/1997, filed on 11/20/1992).

Regarding independent claim 1, Tabata et al disclose: “....image recording apparatus.....which sorts recording paper with image data recorded thereon with a sorter and binds a bundle of the sorted recording paper with a stapler into a book.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-34). Tabata et al fail to teach: *receiving in a computer a first electronic document*. However, Miller et al disclose: “....U/I 52 interfaces....enabling the operator to program print jobs and other instructions.....Main memory 56 has plural hard disks....for storingscanned image data.....” (Col. 4, lines 11-32). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Tabata et al and Miller et al, because Miller et al teach above, that this storage of information would have allowed the operator to process the stored document.

Art Unit: 2776

Moreover, Tabata et al disclose: “....image recording apparatus.....which sorts recording paper with image data recorded thereon with a sorter and binds a bundle of the sorted recording paper with a stapler into a book.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-34). Tabata et al fail to teach: *receiving in the computer a user input that selects an instruction for assembling a hard copy document*. However, Miller et al disclose: “....U/I 52 interfaces....enabling the operator to program print jobs and other instructions.....Main memory 56 has plural hard disks....for storingscanned image data.....” (Col. 4, lines 11-32). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Tabata et al and Miller et al, because Miller et al teach above, that this storage of information would have allowed the operator to process the stored document.

Moreover, Tabata et al disclose: *determining in the computer a visual appearance....*-----
“....When the staple function is selected, the control section 2108 displays a staple position input screen.....” (Col. 20, lines 57-65). Tabata et al teach in the previous quote, the display of the appearance of a document as if it was printed, and bound with a staple.

Furthermore, Tabata et al disclose: *producing as output the determined visual appearance.*---“....When the staple function is selected, the control section 2108 displays a staple position input screen.....” (Col. 20, lines 57-65). Tabata et al teach in the previous quote, printing the selected settings for the binding of the document.

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Tabata et al disclose: *generating a second electronic document which depicts the first electronic document*----- “....When the staple function is selected, the control section 2108 displays a staple position input screen.....” (Col.

Art Unit: 2776

20, lines 57-65). Tabata et al teach in the previous quote, the display of the appearance of a document as if it was printed-- *a second electronic document which depicts the first electronic document--*, and bound with a staple.

Furthermore, Tabata et al disclose: *displaying the second electronic document.--*
“....When the staple function is selected, the control section 2108 displays a staple position input screen.....” (Col. 20, lines 57-65). Tabata et al teach in the previous quote, the display of the appearance of a document as if it was printed, and bound with a staple.

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Tabata et al disclose: *receiving a second user input that selects a second instruction.....--* “....When the staple function is selected, the control section 2108 displays a staple position input screen.....” (Col. 20, lines 57-65). Tabata et al teach in the previous quote, the selection from a menu of options to instruct the system to display of the appearance of a document as if it was printed-- *a second user input--*, and bind it with a staple.

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 2, Tabata et al disclose: *modifying a copy of the first electronic document to generate the second electronic document--* “....When the staple function is selected, the control section 2108 displays a staple position input screen.....” (Col. 20, lines 57-65). Tabata et al teach in the previous quote, the selection from a menu of options to instruct the system to display of the appearance of a document as if it was printed, and bind it with a staple-- *modifying a copy of the first electronic document to generate the second electronic document.*

Art Unit: 2776

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 8, Tabata et al disclose:-- “....image recording apparatus.....which sorts recording paper with image data recorded thereon with a sorter and binds a bundle of the sorted recording paper with a stapler into a book.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-34). Tabata et al fail to teach:*modifying a copy of the first electronic document inserting a page into copy* However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Tabata et al teach above, the sorting of the document in the order selected by the user, and the insertion of a page to be copied into the system for performing image processing.

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 10, Tabata et al disclose: “....image recording apparatus.....which sorts recording paper with image data recorded thereon with a sorter and binds a bundle of the sorted recording paper with a stapler into a book.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-34). Tabata et al fail to teach:*the inserted page is a cover sheet*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Tabata et al teach above, the sorting of the document in the order selected by the user or inserting -- *a cover sheet*.

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 1, Tabata et al disclose: “....image recording apparatus.....which sorts recording paper with image data recorded thereon with a sorter and binds a bundle of the sorted recording paper with a stapler into a book.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-34). Tabata et al fail to teach: *user input is received from an electronic file*. However, Miller et al disclose: “....U/I 52 interfaces....enabling the operator to program print jobs and other instructions.....items displayed on touchscreen 62 such as files.....” (Col. 4,

Art Unit: 2776

lines 11-32). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Tabata et al and Miller et al, because Miller et al teach above, that this storage of information would have allowed the operator to process the stored document.

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 1, Tabata et al disclose: “....image recording apparatus.....which sorts recording paper with image data recorded thereon with a sorter and binds a bundle of the sorted recording paper with a stapler into a book.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-34). Tabata et al fail to teach: *The instruction identifies a printing media to be used....* However, Miller et al disclose: “....the print media may comprise of any variety of sheet sizes.....” (Col. 3, lines 10-20). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Tabata et al and Miller et al, because Miller et al teach above, that this would have allowed the operator to select from a wide variety of printing media.

Regarding claim 14, which depends on claim 13, Tabata et al disclose: “....image recording apparatus.....which sorts recording paper with image data recorded thereon with a sorter and binds a bundle of the sorted recording paper with a stapler into a book.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-34). Tabata et al fail to teach: *the instruction identifies the weight, color, texture.....* However, Miller et al disclose: : “....the print media may comprise of any variety of sheet sizes.....” (Col. 3, lines 10-20). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Tabata et al and Miller et al,

Art Unit: 2776

because Miller et al teach above, that this would have allowed the operator to select from a wide variety of printing media.

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 13, Tabata et al disclose: “....image recording apparatus.....which sorts recording paper with image data recorded thereon with a sorter and binds a bundle of the sorted recording paper with a stapler into a book.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-34). Tabata et al fail to teach: *the instruction identifies a pre-existing image*..... However, Miller et al disclose: : “....the print media may comprise of any variety of sheet sizes.....” (Col. 3, lines 10-20). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Tabata et al and Miller et al, because Miller et al teach above, that this would have allowed the operator to select from a wide variety of printing media.

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 1, Tabata et al disclose: “....image recording apparatus.....which sorts recording paper with image data recorded thereon with a sorter and binds a bundle of the sorted recording paper with a stapler into a book.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-34). Tabata et al fail to teach:*the instruction identifies a cover to be used*..... However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Tabata et al teach above, the sorting of the document in the order selected by the user-- *the instruction identifies a cover to be used*.

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 1, Tabata et al disclose:*the instruction identifies a binding to be used*.....-- “....When the staple function is selected, the control section 2108 displays a staple position input screen.....” (Col. 20, lines 57-65). Tabata et al teach in the

Art Unit: 2776

previous quote, the selection from a menu of options to instruct the system to display of the appearance of a document as if it was printed, and bind it with a staple.

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 17, Tabata et al disclose: “....image recording apparatus.....which sorts recording paper with image data recorded thereon with a sorter and binds a bundle of the sorted recording paper with a stapler into a book.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-34). Tabata et al fail to teach:*the instruction identifies a veloTM, tape, spiral....* However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Tabata et al teach above, the sorting of the document in the order selected by the user and then binding the document.

Regarding claim 19, which depends on claim 1, Tabata et al disclose:*the instruction identifies a physical modification of a printing media.*-- “....image recording apparatus.....which sorts recording paper with image data recorded thereon with a sorter and binds a bundle of the sorted recording paper with a stapler into a book.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-34). Tabata et al teach above, the sorting of the document in the order selected by the user and then binding the document-- *physical modification.*

Regarding claim 20, which depends on claim 19, Tabata et al disclose: “....image recording apparatus.....which sorts recording paper with image data recorded thereon with a sorter and binds a bundle of the sorted recording paper with a stapler into a book.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-34). Tabata et al fail to teach:*the instruction identifies a physical modification of a printing media.*However, Miller et al disclose: “....signature set stitcher 10a, signature set folder 10b, and signature set trimmer 10c.....” (Col. 3, lines 40-67). It would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2776

to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Tabata et al and Miller et al, because Miller et al teach above, that these devices enabled the system to produce a finished document.

Regarding claim 21, which depends on claim 1, Tabata et al disclose: *...the user input is received through an interactive user interface--* “....When the staple function is selected, the control section 2108 displays a staple position input screen.....” (Col. 20, lines 57-65). Tabata et al teach in the previous quote, the selection from a menu of options-- *an interactive user interface--* to instruct the system to display of the appearance of a document as if it was printed, and bind it with a staple.

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 21, Tabata et al disclose: *...receiving the user input includes displaying a plurality of instruction identifiers.....--* “....When the staple function is selected, the control section 2108 displays a staple position input screen.....” (Col. 20, lines 57-65). Tabata et al teach in the previous quote, the selection from a menu of options-- *instruction identifiers--* to instruct the system to display of the appearance of a document as if it was printed, and bind it with a staple.

Claim 23 is directed towards a method for displaying a finished hard copy document for implementing the steps found in claim1, and is similarly rejected.

Claim 24 is directed towards a computer-assisted method for creating a hard copy document for implementing the steps found in claim1, and is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 25, which depends on claim 24, Tabata et al disclose: *...the document assembler prints the electronic document.....--* “....When the staple function is selected, the

Art Unit: 2776

control section 2108 displays a staple position input screen.....the user touches 'Execute' on the screen, the selected staple position is transferred to the control section....." (Col. 20, lines 57-65, and Fig. 20A-20E). Tabata et al teach in the previous quote, the printing, and binding with a staple of a document.

Regarding claim 26, which depends on claim 24, Tabata et al disclose: *...creating a second electronic document which depicts the visual appearance of the hard copy document.....*--"....When the staple function is selected, the control section 2108 displays a staple position input screen....." (Col. 20, lines 57-65). Tabata et al teach in the previous quote, the display of the appearance of a document as if it was printed, and bound with a staple.

Claim 27 is directed towards a computer program for implementing the steps found in claim1, and is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 5, Tabata et al disclose: "....image recording apparatus.....which sorts recording paper with image data recorded thereon with a sorter and binds a bundle of the sorted recording paper with a stapler into a book....." (Col. 6, lines 18-34). Tabata et al fail to teach: *the computer receives user input that selects a plurality of instructions*. However, Miller et al disclose: "....U/I 52 interfaces....enabling the operator to program print jobs and other instructions.....Main memory 56 has plural hard disks....for storingscanned image data....." (Col. 4, lines 11-32). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Tabata et al and Miller et al, because Miller et al teach above, that this storage of information would have allowed the operator to process the stored document.

Art Unit: 2776

Regarding claim 30, which depends on claim 20, Tabata et al disclose: “....image recording apparatus.....which sorts recording paper with image data recorded thereon with a sorter and binds a bundle of the sorted recording paper with a stapler into a book.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-34). Tabata et al fail to teach:*the instruction identifies cutting of the printing media*. However, Miller et al disclose: “....signature set stitcher 10a, signature set folder 10b, and signature set trimmer 10c.....” (Col. 3, lines 40-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Tabata et al and Miller et al, because Miller et al teach above, that these devices enabled the system to produce a finished document.

Regarding claim 31, which depends on claim 20, Tabata et al disclose: “....image recording apparatus.....which sorts recording paper with image data recorded thereon with a sorter and binds a bundle of the sorted recording paper with a stapler into a book.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-34). Tabata et al fail to teach:*the instruction identifies folding of the printing media*. However, Miller et al disclose: “....signature set stitcher 10a, signature set folder 10b, and signature set trimmer 10c.....” (Col. 3, lines 40-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Tabata et al and Miller et al, because Miller et al teach above, that these devices enabled the system to produce a finished document.

Regarding claim 34, which depends on claim 4, Tabata et al disclose:*extracting information from the first electronic document--* “....A first image....is formed as described abovewhich sorts recording paper with image data recorded thereon with a sorter and

Art Unit: 2776

binds a bundle of the sorted recording paper with a stapler into a book.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-34). Tabata et al teach in the previous quote, the extraction of image information to be printed.

Claim 38 is directed towards a method of depicting a hard copy document for implementing the steps found in claim1, and is similarly rejected.

Claim 39 is directed towards a method of depicting a hard copy document for implementing the steps found in claim1, and is similarly rejected.

Claim 40 is directed towards a method of depicting a hard copy document for implementing the steps found in claim1, and is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 42, which depends on claim 1, Tabata et al disclose: “....image recording apparatus.....which sorts recording paper with image data recorded thereon with a sorter and binds a bundle of the sorted recording paper with a stapler into a book.....” (Col. 6, lines 18-34). Tabata et al fail to teach: *producing the determined visual appearance as output includes displaying the determined visual appearance on a computer monitor*. However, Miller et al disclose: “....U/I 52 interfaces....enabling the operator to program print jobs and other instructions.....Main memory 56 has plural hard disks....for storingscanned image data.....” (Col. 4, lines 11-32). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Tabata et al and Miller et al, because Miller et al teach above, that this storage of information would have allowed the operator to process the stored document.

Regarding claim 43, which depends on claim 1, Tabata et al disclose:*determining the visual appearance includes obscuring a portion of the output*--“....When the staple

Art Unit: 2776

function is selected, the control section 2108 displays a staple position input screen.....” (Col. 20, lines 57-65, and Fig. 20A-20E). Tabata et al teach in the previous quote, the display of the obscured appearance of a document as if it was printed, and bound with a staple.

Claim 44 is directed towards a method for implementing the steps found in claim 1, and is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 45, which depends on claim 1, Tabata et al disclose:*determining the visual appearance includes providing an of the thickness*--“....automatic change mode shown in Fig. 13 (b), a binding space width of recording paper becomes gradually larger.....” (Col. 21, lines 40-67). Tabata et al teach in the previous quote, the display of the a binding width of the appearance of a document before it was printed, and bound with a staple.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 5-9, 29, 32-33, 35-37, and 41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 13, 15-28, and 31-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Miller et al teach receiving a document in a computer system to be assembled. Tabata et al teach previewing a finished document once bound in a screen. The Examiner established the obviousness for this combination in the rejections set forth herein; please, refer to those rejections above.

Art Unit: 2776

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Andersen et al. (Pat. # 5,903,905), Warnock et al. (Pat. # 5,634,064), Miyasaka et al. (Pat. # 5,155,144), Washio et al. (Pat. # 5,467,702), Imaizumi (Pat. # 5,268,717), Levine (Pat. # 5,191,440), Masuzaki et al. (Pat. # 5,150,458), Ross et al. (Pat. # 6,026,417), Tani (Pat. # 5,442,432) and Natsume et al. (Pat. # 6,014,528).


II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi, can be reached on (703) 305-4713. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day. The formal and informal fax phone numbers for this Group are (703) 308-9051 and 308-5403 respectively.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

cbp

03/13/00


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER